REMARKS

Claims 1-58 were rejected in an Office Action dated May 18, 2007. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 18, 36 and 40. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, following the present response, claims 1-58 are pending.

It should be noted that the amendments made herein should not necessitate a new search since the notion of *detecting candidates for multilingual analysis* has been added to the claims and remarked on during the last response (See Response, dated January 9, 2007). The present amendments constitute mere cosmetic clarifications.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-58 standard rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182447) in view of Davallou (U.S. Patent No. 6,976,019).

By way of example and not limitation, claim 1 recites:

In a computing system, a method for providing automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis in connection with a process implicating a URL input mechanism, comprising:
      receiving URL input from a client computing device;
      determining whether the URL input is valid;
      when the URL input is invalid, *detecting whether said input is a **likely candidate** for multilingual analysis, and if said input is a likely candidate for said multilingual analysis, performing intelligent rules-based analysis including said multilingual analysis*, and identifying the invalid aspects of the invalid URL input;
      transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis; and
      suggesting at least one of the said alternative URLs.

(emphasis added). Claim 1, above, recites *detecting whether an input is a likely candidate for multilingual analysis, and then if the input is such a candidate, performing intelligent rules-based analysis including multilingual analysis.*

The Applicants echo remarks made during the last office action, namely, that it should be noted that this limitation adds a subtle aspect to claim 1, and should not be interpreted as merely performing multilingual analysis:

Advantageously, instead of blindly passing the user typed URL input NRP 240 for multilingual domain name resolution, the invention uses intelligence when deciding to redirect.

Thus, the invention provides algorithm(s) to detect that the user typed URL is a likely candidate for a multilingual domain, and only when this is true, is the input redirected to NRP 240. Since, other than the multilingual domain opportunity, NRP 240 cannot handle the user typed URL error, it is wasteful to route to NRP 240 unnecessarily.

(Specification, p. 15, ll. 22-27). Thus, *this aspect avoids such wasteful routing (and hence computing)*. Please see Fig. 4 for elements corresponding to the above discussed elements.

As is explained in figure 4, after URL input is determined to be invalid at 210, the claimed embodiments, at 400, detect whether the name resolution provider (NRP) can effectively perform multilingual analysis at 240. (Figure 4, & Specification at page 14, paragraph 2). If the URL input contains a likely candidate, then the input is sent to the NRP. If the URL input does not contain a likely candidate for multilingual analysis, then the claimed embodiments avoid blindly passing URL input to the NRP. (Specification at page 15, paragraph 4). Thus, multilingual analysis can occur when it is necessary to do so – but it need not always be performed. This way, the claimed subject matter is smart about when to perform analysis and it can thus conserve valuable computing cycles when such analysis need not be performed.

Contrast this to Davallou, which always performs its analysis after URL input is determined to be invalid (col. 3, lines 48-62). At no point does Davallou disclose detecting likely candidates for multilingual analysis. Rather, Davallou merely discloses that phonetic-based searching may be used to "best match the sounds of the typed word/s in the user's language (or various languages)" immediately after a user is unable to find a search result using a traditional search engine. *Id.* Utilizing phonetic-based searching after a user is unable to find a search result is not the equivalent of detecting candidates for multilingual analysis. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claims 1, 18, 36, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Insofar as claims 2-17 and 55, 19-35 and 56, 37-39 and 57, and 41-54 and 58, depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 18, 36, and 40, respectively, they also patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to

reconsider the rejection of claims 1-58 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Schiling in view of Davallou.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney Greg Plichta at 206-902-2461.

Date: September 6, 2007   / Grzegorz S. Plichta /
                                                    Grzegorz S. Plichta
                                                    Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP
999 Third Avenue Suite 3600
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: (206) 332-1380
Facsimile: (206) 624-7317